

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Keyes.

SENATOR KEYES: Mr. Speaker, I won't take up very much of your time, probably not over three minutes. Senator Carsten, who knows the Committee amendments better than anybody that I know, and the senators that have put amendments on the bill today, I don't believe anybody can stand here and tell me exactly what the bill does. I would suggest that we take the Committee amendments and all the amendments that have went on the bill off, put the bill back in its original form as it came to the Committee, and pass the bill on over to Final Reading. I move that we do that. Nobody can explain what's happened to this bill. It's a bad one. But what we do need, we need to let the people know that we are serious about a lid bill. We are not fooling around. We are not horsing around. When you have a group of people such as drafted the amendments, and I want to let you know who drafted these amendments that we accepted, and they were the ESUs, the Voc Techs, the League of Municipalities, the NRDs and I think the schools had their fingers in it, and the county governments, and if you think they're going to design a lid bill that's meaningful, I don't think my good friend out there...I think he's still in the room, I don't think he would do that. So I would advise you just to kill all the amendments, and then advance the bill as it originally was.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I probably am as frustrated as many others are with LB 285. I think we have seriously and conscientiously tried to draft a bill that would clarify LB 1, make it workable with governmental subdivisions, and still include the concept of LB 1. I agree that some of the amendments that have been adopted have gotten a little bit afield of what I had hoped that we might do. Some of the amendments that we have adopted are absolutely necessary to the bill, which we failed to get into the bill when it was originally drafted. I would hope that we would not reject all of the amendments. I would also like to make note that we might... and I don't know this for sure, but I think that we do have a bill that might be subject to a veto. At this point I am not sure there is thirty votes here to override a veto, and then what will you have left? You'll have LB 1, and maybe that's what you want, and maybe that's what we have to have as has been expressed here several times today. I don't truly believe that, and I don't believe we as legislators should follow that pattern. I think we should make